REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of March 23, 2006. This Amendment is timely filed with a one month extension extending to July 24, 2006 (July 23 is a Sunday). The current status of the claims is summarized below.

Claim 9 - 13 are currently amended.

Claims 1-20 remain pending.

Applicants thank the Examiner for a careful review of the application. Specification has been amended to replace the docket number of an application incorporated by reference with the appropriate application number. Clarifications to address the ambiguity in the specification are presented.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks submitted in support thereof.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 6-8, 10 and 11 were rejected under 112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The specification has been modified to include the application number of the application that has been incorporated by reference. As mentioned in the amended specification, details of the pre-processing operation, the translation layer operation, text based tasks and the precompiled tasks are contained in Application No. 10/645,789 that has been incorporated by reference and is specified in the amended specification. Based on the amended specification, the Applicants request the 112 rejections of claims 6-8, 10 and 11 be withdrawn. Furthermore, the Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion that one skilled in the art would not know how to associate text file based tasks to HDL based tasks, as this can be achieved through tables and other tools readily available to software developers. If this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide a reasonable basis for maintaining this rejection. It is to be noted that no other objections or rejections have been made on claims 6-

8, 10 and 11. The Applicants, therefore, request the rejection 112 be withdrawn and the claims made allowable.

Claims 9 – 13 were rejected under 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements. Claims 9 – 13 have been amended to include essential structural relationships of elements. Based on the now amended claims 9 –13, the Applicants request the 112 rejections be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C § 101:

Claims 9 – 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 101 for lack of patentable utility. Claims 9 – 13 have been amended to include the essential structural relationships of elements. Based on the amended claims 9 –13, the Applicants request the 101 rejections be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1, 3, 5, 9, 12-14, 16, 18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Hartman el al. (U.S. PG Pub 2003/0208351) (hereinafter Hartman) in view of Akin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,245) (hereinafter Akin). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hartman discloses a method for verification of a system implementation of a software program. According to Hartman, the test cases provide input to the execution engine with the execution engine acting as a server. However, Hartman does not suggest or teach initializing the execution engine. Hartman suggests looping back to process the next test case. The loop back mechanism of Hartman is not the same as that of the claimed invention as the execution engine of Hartman is not initialized *prior* to executing each test case. This will result in the execution engine of Hartman providing a different execution engine environment for different test cases as the test cases might affect the execution engine environment settings pertinent to the test cases. In contrast, the simulation server of the claimed invention is uninitialized after each test case is run and re-initialized prior to running subsequent test

cases in order to provide the same simulation server environment for each test case. (*See paragraph [0028] lines 5-7*). Additionally, as the Examiner has pointed out, Hartman does not disclose verifying the test case at the client prior to submitting the test case to a pre-initialized simulation server.

Akin teaches requesting the appropriate test case data from the server by the client. However, the request for appropriate test case data by the client is to receive the correct version of the data from a central repository which is then used by the client to run the test cases using the test program. There is no mention of verifying for format or syntax errors of the test data at the client. This is different from the claimed invention where the test case is verified *at* the client, rather than the server, for syntax and formatting errors *prior* to submitting the test case to the server for executing on the pre-initialized simulation server. (*See paragraph [0027] lines 13-16*). The simulation server of the claimed invention runs the test case on the simulation server and returns the result to the client unlike Akin where the server manages the central repository of test case data and does not run the actual test on the server. In fact, both Akin and Hartman teach or suggest that the test cases are run at the client (clones, in Hartman) with the data requested from the server. (*See Hartman paragraph 0154 and Akin, column 4, lines 45-62).* Additionally, Akin and Hartman do not teach uninitializing and re-initializing of the server after each test case.

Hartman teaches a method for verification of a system implementation of a software program by generating test programs to be executed on system-under-test, synchronizing these test programs executing on the system-under-test and verifying the results against a behavioral model. Akin teaches a method that allows selective access to a central repository of test case data used in testing software programs. Combining the teachings of Hartman with Akin would result in generating test programs to be executed on system-under-test with selected access to test data on a central repository and will not provide a proper system

implementation verification as claimed in Hartman. Additionally, the combined teachings do not suggest or teach uninitializing and re-initializing simulation server prior to running each test case or disclose verifying the test case at the client prior to submitting the test case to a pre-initialized simulation server. Based on the arguments presented, Applicants request that the 103 rejections be withdrawn and claims 1, 3, 5, 9, 12-14, 16, 18 and 20 be made allowable.

Claims 4 and 19 were rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman in view of Akin and further in view of Conan et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,810,364) (hereinafter Conan). Conan, like Hartman, discloses a method for automated testing of software on a client-server system. Although Conan discloses a queue system maintained at the server level, the queue system of Conan is used to store resource data to indicate resources available on a set of clients for software testing. (*See column 6, lines 9-17*). This is not the same as the queuing system of the claimed invention where the queue is used to hold the test cases till the simulation server resources become available. Additionally, Conan does not suggest or teach verifying the test case *at* the client for syntax and formatting errors *prior* to submitting the test case to the simulation server, which is pre-initialized before each test case is run. Conan, like Hartman, teaches managing the system resources for software testing. As mentioned above for Hartman, Conan does not suggest or teach all the elements of the claimed invention. As a result, Conan independently or combined with Hartman and Akin does not suggest all the elements of the claimed invention. The Applicants, therefore, request that the 103 rejections be withdrawn for claims 4 and 19.

Claims 2, 15 and 17 were rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman in view of Akin and further in view of Danialy et al (U.S. PG Pub 2002/0073374) (hereinafter Danialy). Danialy discloses a method with an embedded test architecture designed within an integrated circuit (IC), with the IC transferring data to an external system

which performs relevant test and diagnosis. As Hartman and Conan have suggested, the test case of Danialy, is conducted at the client and the diagnostic program is managed by the server. Danialy does not suggest pre-initializing the server prior to receiving test case data. The syntax and format checking of Danialy is to specify test steps, test groups and runtime parameters for the diagnostic data and is not to verify for errors before forwarding the test case to the server. (*See page 4, paragraph 0043*). Additionally, the text based tasks of Danialy are not verified for syntax and formatting errors. They are used for specifying parameters as mentioned earlier. Therefore, Danialy does not teach all the elements of the claimed invention. Combining Danialy with Hartman and Akin will not teach or suggest all the elements of the claimed invention. The Applicants, therefore, requests that the 103 rejections of claims 2, 15 and 17 be withdrawn.

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present Amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 774-6905. **Please charge $110.00 for the one month extension to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. ADAPP244).** If any other fees are due in connection with filing this Amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. ADAPP244). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP

Jayanthi Minisandram

Jayanthi Minisandram
Reg. No. 53,330

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
Telephone: (408) 749-6900
Facsimile: (408) 749-6901
Customer No.